1115 No BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA
October 15, 1967

Dear Harold,

Many thanks for the Jenner memo on "Oswald's Weight". It bears out the strong point I made of the utter impossibility of Tippit's having apprehended Oswald on the basis of Brennan's description via the police bulletin. Poor old Jenner! He really doesn't know his stuff at all, because what is far more to the point than the August 1963 New Orleans police record of Oswald's weight, is the one done during the weekend of November 22 - 24 by the Dallas police, which lists his weight as 131 pounds, 5 pounds less than the New Orleans record indicates! As for memos on 1026, anything you can find on that score is, of course, of interest to me but I seriously doubt that Fritz knew the address as early as 2:30 P.M. If one is to believe that the Dallas police had no previous knowledge of that address, I do not accept the premise for the simple reason that the evidence shows that the police were at 1026 North Beckley by 1:30, a time when Oswald had not yet even been apprehended. In other words, according to the evidence from Fritz, Hill, and other policemen, no one knew anything about the Beckley address until mid-afternoon, yet it is clear from Earlene Roberts that the police arrived at Beckley within half an hour after Oswald left there.

I was absolutely horrified to learn of the tragedy which has befallen Shirley Martin. From all reports, she and Vickie were very close. Additionally, Anne-Lise Lane writes me that Vickie was to have been married in three weeks. Whatever the circumstances, I can think of nothing more overwhelmingly sad than for a parent to lose a child.

What did you think of Arnoni's piece in the current T.M.O.? While I agree that there are many doubtful areas in the Garrison probe, many things which trouble me, I nevertheless continue to feel that the trial must be allowed to take place and that Garrison must be allowed to show what evidence he has. The campaign to stop him only adds to the suspicion that he will develop too much damaging evidence, as far as our adversaries are concerned. What I dislike about the Arnoni article, in particular, is the fact that I detect an underlying dishonesty in the case he has built against Garrison and while I welcome honest debate and constructive criticism, even though it may be directed against Garrison, I cannot help but be dismayed when the criticism is as unfair as it is in the Arnoni article.

For example, Arnoni makes a very strong point to the effect that G. has gone out of his way to court the critics. In my case, although I have sent him material repeatedly over the past six months, I never received a single response from him until about two weeks ago when he finally acknowledged receipt of my most recent communication. For another example, Arnoni chastises Garrison for procrastinating about the trial, as if it were not the defense which has moved to postpone the trial. My own policy, where the Garrison probe is concerned, has been and continues to be one of "wait and see, let him go to court, and let him stand or fall on the evidence he can produce; why try to stop him". I do not know what evidence he has, and as I have said before, there are many questionable areas, but I am willing to give him the opportunity to make his case. Incidentally, he is here at the present time and we have all met with him.

Thank you again, Harold, for the items you have sent. We are all eagerly looking forward to "Oswald in New Orleans" and I wish you great success with it. Much happiness, too, in your new "digs". Best wishes always,

Maggie